



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER

CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 798, 9 April 2010

Articles & Other Documents:

[Washington Summit to Call for Action to Damp Illicit Trade and Keep Weapons Out of Terrorists' Hands](#)

[NORTH KOREA HAS NUCLEAR WEAPONS, CLINTON SAYS](#)

[After Prague, What's Next for Arms Control?](#)

[Iran derides Obama's 'cowboy' nuclear stance 'Get some experience,' Ahmadinejad says](#)

[A Treaty With No Losers](#)

[President Obama's Nuclear Summit: Q&A with Professor Graham Allison](#)

[Pak, China to adopt joint strategy at US nuclear summit](#)

[Obama's Nuclear Plans Face Daunting Obstacles](#)

[North Korea Scorns UN Human Rights Move](#)

[Gates warns Iran and North Korea on nuke policy](#)

['China ready to stay out of PoK'](#)

Welcome to the CPC Outreach Journal. As part of USAF Counterproliferation Center's mission to counter weapons of mass destruction through education and research, we're providing our government and civilian community a source for timely counterproliferation information. This information includes articles, papers and other documents addressing issues pertinent to US military response options for dealing with chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) threats and countermeasures. It's our hope this information resource will help enhance your counterproliferation issue awareness.

Established in 1998, the USAF/CPC provides education and research to present and future leaders of the Air Force, as well as to members of other branches of the armed services and Department of Defense. Our purpose is to help those agencies better prepare to counter the threat from weapons of mass destruction. Please feel free to visit our web site at <http://cpc.au.af.mil/> for in-depth information and specific points of contact. The following articles, papers or documents do not necessarily reflect official endorsement of the United States Air Force, Department of Defense, or other US government agencies. Reproduction for private use or commercial gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. All rights are reserved.

WSJ.com

7 April 2010

Crackdown Sought on Nuclear Material

Washington Summit to Call for Action to Damp Illicit Trade and Keep Weapons Out of Terrorists' Hands

By DAVID CRAWFORD And PETER SPIEGEL

A proposed communiqué calls for leaders from more than 40 countries to endorse a global crackdown on the illicit trade of nuclear material at a summit in Washington next week.

The communiqué, which was reviewed by The Wall Street Journal, calls for tougher criminal prosecution of traffickers, better accounting for weapons-grade nuclear materials and more international collaboration in such cases. The international community must "effectively prevent and respond to incidents of illicit nuclear trafficking," the draft says.

Israeli military police in November with weapons, seized from a ship near Cyprus, that were bound for Hezbollah from Iran.

The U.S.-led initiative comes as Washington has been pushing for tougher sanctions against Iran in connection with Tehran's nuclear program. Though Iran isn't officially on the agenda of next week's meeting, officials said Tehran's suspected nuclear-weapons program and the international effort to contain it have lent the meeting an additional sense of urgency.

An Iranian firm closely linked to Tehran's nuclear program has allegedly acquired special hardware for enriching uranium, a key step toward making an atomic bomb, The Wall Street Journal reported Saturday, despite sanctions intended to keep such equipment out of Iran.

On Tuesday, meanwhile, the Obama administration unveiled a nuclear-weapons strategy that establishes new formal limits on their use, prompting criticism from both advocates of more ambitious curbs and conservatives who questioned the decision to alter decades of bipartisan consensus on how to deter enemy attacks.

President Barack Obama and his top military and diplomatic aides said the new 72-page Nuclear Posture Review moves the U.S. closer to Mr. Obama's goal of eventually eliminating nuclear weaponry. But some arms-control specialists said the document was too timid, and fell short of their expectations by failing to adopt a no-first-use policy and to keep open the option of striking some non-nuclear targets, such as Iran and North Korea.

Arizona Sen. Jon Kyl, who has emerged as the leading Republican critic of Mr. Obama's nuclear policies, said he was troubled by the decision to take several non-nuclear threats off the U.S.'s target list, an early salvo in what could become a partisan battle over Mr. Obama's nuclear agenda in the coming months.

Through the Cracks

Recent attempts to curb arms trafficking show the extent of trade in weapons

June—July 2009: A North Korean cargo ship suspected of carrying arms to Myanmar's military regime changes course and heads back home after U.S. naval vessels track the vessel for nearly two weeks.

December 2009: Authorities in Thailand detain a plane filled with North Korean weapons destined for illegal export. Thai officials say the flight was headed for Iran, but it was unclear who masterminded the arms purchase or where the arms were ultimately going to be used.

March 2010: Police in Italy arrested seven men, including two Iranian government officials, on charges of illegally exporting military equipment to Iran. The seven are accused of buying sensitive goods legally in Germany and other European countries and shipping the goods to Iran via Switzerland, the U.K., Romania and the United Arab Emirates.

March 2010: An Iranian firm linked to Tehran's nuclear program acquires special hardware for enriching uranium made by a French company that until December was owned by U.S. conglomerate Tyco International, despite sanctions intended to keep such equipment out of Iran, people familiar with the case say.

The new policy narrows the range of threats the Pentagon will seek to deter with nuclear weapons. Because of advances in missile defense and conventional weapons, the new policy states that the U.S. no longer will target most non-nuclear states, even those that threaten use of chemical and biological weapons.

The document stops short of declaring that deterring a nuclear attack is the "sole purpose" of the U.S. arsenal, however. The policy states that because there are some countries that have not lived up to their obligations under international nuclear treaties, the U.S. reserved the right to keep noncomplying countries targeted.

Defense Secretary Robert Gates said the carve-out was specifically aimed at Iran and North Korea, which are signatories to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty but have been cited for violations or, in the case of North Korea, have threatened to withdraw from the pact.

Next week's summit would hardly be the first international initiative aimed at curbing the illegal nuclear trade. Officials involved in the talks say the U.S.'s primary goal for the summit is to refocus global attention on proliferation amid concern that previous efforts to curtail the spread of atomic technology and material have fallen short.

A big concern is the threat posed by terrorist organizations such as al Qaeda, which the U.S. and other countries worry could acquire nuclear materials for a bomb.

Several terrorist groups, including al Qaeda, have attempted to acquire weapons of mass destruction or to build conventional bombs that would blast out nuclear waste as shrapnel, according to Western intelligence officials.

Officials from the U.S. and other Western countries also cite developments in Iran, which they say has managed to secretly advance its nuclear weapons program, as evidence for the need for stricter enforcement. Iran says its nuclear program is only for peaceful purposes.

A spokeswoman for the U.S. mission to the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna said Tuesday that the U.S. is concerned about preventing Iran from obtaining key nuclear parts.

"The prevention of nuclear trafficking is a key part of the U.S. non-proliferation strategy," she said.

Leaders from more than 40 nations, including China and India, are expected to take part in next week's summit. Mr. Obama first announced plans for a nuclear security summit last year.

In addition to the calls for tougher controls on the nuclear black market, leaders are expected to agree on a proposal urging countries to convert nuclear reactors powered by highly enriched fuel, which can be more easily repurposed for use in nuclear weapons than low-enriched uranium, into reactors using low-enriched fuel.

The proposed communiqué also reaffirms the "essential" role of the IAEA in policing compliance with existing international nuclear treaties and calls on states to cooperate in developing databases of incidents of suspected illicit trafficking.

In addition to the communiqué, leaders at the summit are expected to endorse a "work plan" that outlines more detailed actions that countries can take to reduce nuclear trafficking.

A follow-up conference is planned for 2012, according to the draft.

Write to David Crawford at david.crawford@wsj.com and Peter Spiegel at peter.spiegel@wsj.com
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304172404575168193600521712.html?mod=WSJ_World_LEFTS_econdNews#printMode

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

NYT.com

8 April 2010

I.H.T. OP-ED CONTRIBUTOR

After Prague, What's Next for Arms Control?

By *GEORGE PERKOVICH*

In Prague one year ago, President Obama declared “America’s commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons.” The speech elicited strong reactions around the world. Elites and media who favor nuclear disarmament applauded. Others jeered, warning that a world without nuclear weapons would destabilize regional and global power balances and raise the risks of great power war.

More importantly, the range of states whose cooperation would be necessary to implement the Prague agenda either oppose it or have done little to help achieve it. Public opinion has not mobilized to make nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation a highly salient issue in any single country, including the United States. The result is a president ready to lead a long-term campaign to remove the existential threats posed by nuclear weapons, but as yet lacking sufficient followers to make it happen.

Proponents and critics have selectively interpreted or misinterpreted the vision Mr. Obama set out in Prague. Some on the left hope (and on the right fear) that he intends to pursue a treaty to ban nuclear weapons, or that he contemplates unilateral U.S. nuclear disarmament. Some believe that all of the obstacles to global disarmament will somehow fall out of the way now that the U.S. has an enlightened leader. Some charge that he will leave allies in Europe and Asia vulnerable to Russia, China, North Korea or Iran.

In reality, Mr. Obama had in mind neither the caricature of the left nor that of the right. As he said clearly in Prague, nuclear weapons probably could not be eliminated in his lifetime, and the United States would maintain a nuclear deterrent as long as other states possess or threaten to acquire these weapons. The Nuclear Posture Review released by the Pentagon on Tuesday clearly negates the idea of U.S. unilateral nuclear disarmament. So does the president’s increased budget to refurbish the aging infrastructure of nuclear weapons laboratories and material-handling facilities.

Rather, Mr. Obama posits the need for all states that now possess nuclear weapons or rely on extended nuclear deterrence to take the steps necessary to obviate their perceived need for these weapons. The Posture Review reaffirms America’s interest in a world without nuclear weapons and clearly reduces the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. security policy. It calls for high-level talks with Russia and China to promote the stability and cooperation that would lead to global reductions of nuclear weapons and cooperation in regional security-building. This is an inherently multilateral challenge. As Mr. Obama said, “all nations must come together to build a stronger, global regime.”

It is only realistic to think that the eventual elimination of all nuclear arsenals would proceed in a co-evolutionary process. Improvements in security relations among key states will facilitate arms control and disarmament steps, which in turn beget further improvements in security relations, and so on.

The new START accord helps improve U.S.-Russian relations, but differences in capabilities and doubts about intentions will make further steps harder. NATO states worry about Russian bullying and so-called “tactical nuclear weapons,” while Russia will cling to its nuclear weapons unless conventional military balances are readjusted and it is reassured about future U.S. missile defense capabilities.

The U.S. and China have only begun to explore how their strategic relations could be cooperative over the long-term. China, India, and Pakistan have not yet imagined the sorts of confidence-building and arms control processes that would be required to reverse their nuclear build ups. In the Middle East, Israel’s willingness to move toward nuclear disarmament would depend on achieving durable peace with its neighbors and verifiable guarantees that Iran and other regional states would not acquire nuclear weapons.

Countries without nuclear arms were in many ways the primary audience Mr. Obama sought to influence with the Prague speech. To some extent he succeeded. Newspapers around the world reflected wide support. The Nobel Committee was moved to award him its peace prize (which actually did not help his nuclear agenda at home or in Moscow).

But the leaders of Brazil, South Africa, Indonesia, Malaysia and other influential non-nuclear-weapon states have not embraced Mr. Obama’s logic that step-by-step progress on disarmament needs to be reciprocated by step-by-step progress in strengthening the nonproliferation regime. The Nuclear Posture Review strengthens the U.S. assurance to non-nuclear-weapon states that it “will not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons” against them. It is reasonable for such states to insist that the United States and other nuclear-armed countries must deliver more disarmament. Yet they could encourage this by communicating their intent to reciprocate with concrete measures to strengthen

nonproliferation rules and enforcement in light of flaws exposed by the A.Q. Khan network and the actions of Iran and North Korea.

Two approaching events will indicate whether Mr. Obama has made progress with non-nuclear-weapon states. Next week he will be the host of a meeting of leaders from 40 states to enhance cooperation to prevent nuclear terrorism. In May, the parties to the nonproliferation treaty will gather in New York to review the accord. All the leaders attending will be asked to make commitments to guard nuclear material and prevent nuclear smuggling and terrorism. Will they follow up? Will they act to build the material-accounting and control systems necessary not only to prevent nuclear terrorism but also to enable verification of nuclear disarmament?

The nonproliferation review conference in May requires a consensus of the nearly 200 states in attendance in order to make new nonproliferation rules or to leverage compliance with current rules. In practice this makes the conference simply a barometer of moods and trends.

Will the consensus express strong enduring support for the nonproliferation regime, or instead a sense of hedging and recrimination? Will key states without nuclear weapons support universal adoption of the stronger International Atomic Energy Agency inspection protocols necessary to build everyone's confidence that proliferation will not occur as nuclear energy technology spreads to new markets?

In word and deed Mr. Obama shows he would like to push harder to reduce nuclear dangers, which he knows cannot be accomplished with double standards and agreements that only benefit the United States. Without follow-on forces determined to widen the offensive he has opened, he risks being cut off and isolated. The most important question is whether those who support the president's agenda will become more active or instead will turn away in passive resignation.

George Perkovich is vice president of studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/08/opinion/08iht-edperkovich.html?ref=global&pagewanted=print>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

TheMoscowTimes.com

7 April 2010

A Treaty With No Losers

By Vladimir Yevseyev

More than year has passed since U.S. Vice President Joe Biden announced in at the Munich security conference a "reset" in U.S.-Russian relations. Five months after Biden's speech, Russia allowed the United States and other NATO allies to transport supplies through Russian territory to Afghanistan, and this was a welcome breakthrough in bilateral relations. But on Thursday, the two countries will hit a much larger reset button: Presidents Barack Obama and Dmitry Medvedev will sign the New START agreement in Prague.

When the treaty talks began, Washington had little desire to reduce its nuclear arsenal. Since its nuclear missiles and warheads do not need to be upgraded, the United States could have kept its arsenal at the current levels for the next 10 years and not worry about falling behind Russia. As Russia's aging nuclear weapons become obsolete and decommissioned, its nuclear arsenal will be reduced in any case. Although it will try to modernize its nuclear weapons, its ability to do so will be limited. Thus, is clear that Moscow was more interested in arms reductions than Washington.

Nonetheless, Obama has taken a broader look at disarmament — particularly after his key disarmament speech in Prague on April 5, 2009, and because he is trying to assume a leadership role in furthering the global disarmament goals set out in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Moreover, the United States has clearly shifted its security priorities away from nuclear deterrence and toward fighting international terrorism. Since the end of the Cold War, Washington is far less concerned about a nuclear confrontation with Russia, and this has significantly reduced the need for nuclear weapons to ensure national security. As a result, Washington is placing more importance on high-precision conventional weapons, including the refitting of four Ohio class nuclear submarines to carry long-range cruise missiles. Russia, in turn, is focusing on modernizing its fleet of Tu-160 strategic bombers for use in non-nuclear conflicts.

In addition, it became clear to the United States that solving the Iranian nuclear problem and fighting the Taliban in Afghanistan require Russia's help. Moscow is assisting in both areas, which clearly strengthens the U.S.-Russian partnership.

Of course, the negotiation process for the new treaty was difficult. Some of the decisions made by the U.S. administration with regard to the deployment of elements of its missile defense systems in Poland and Romania complicated matters further. Yet contrary to the opinions of many skeptics, negotiations were completed successfully in a reasonable time frame. This marks a major personal achievement by the heads of both delegations: director of the Foreign Ministry department of security and disarmament Anatoly Antonov and U.S. State Department Assistant Secretary Rose Gottemoeller.

The new agreement stipulates that within seven years after the treaty is ratified, each side must reduce the number of its operationally deployed strategic delivery vehicles to 700 and the number of deployed nuclear warheads to 1,550. Russia insisted that the preamble of the new treaty state that defensive weapons should not undermine the viability and effectiveness of offensive weapons. Also, Article 5 of the treaty prohibits the refitting of missile defense systems to give them the ability to launch offensive missiles. In addition, the treaty no longer allows U.S. observers to be stationed at the Votkinsk plant in the Udmurtia republic, the main factory producing the country's ballistic missiles. Russia secured an important clause that the exchange of missile flight telemetry data is now voluntary, and the number of reciprocal inspections will be reduced.

The New START treaty does not draw a line between winners and losers. Both sides come out as winners by working toward global disarmament. This could become the reset's largest dividend.

Vladimir Yevseyev is a security analyst with the Institute of Global Economy and International Affairs.

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/print/opinion/article/a-treaty-with-no-losers/403412.html>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

The Nation (Pakistan)

8 April 2010

Pak, China to adopt joint strategy at US nuclear summit

By: Abrar Saeed |

ISLAMABAD – Prime Minister Syed Yousuf Raza Gilani reiterated his Government's commitment to take all political parties into confidence on all the national policies particularly related to defence, Kashmir and nuclear issues.

He informed the members that he desired to take all the political forces in to confidence before his visit to Washington to participate in the Nuclear Security Summit to be held on April 12-13.

In his opening statement while chairing a special meeting of the Parliamentary Committee on National Security at the Constitutional Committee Room in the Parliament House on Wednesday afternoon, the Prime Minister said that Pakistan being a nuclear state was cognizant of its responsibilities and had developed an effective nuclear safety, security and non-proliferation measures underpinned by extensive legislative, regulatory and administrative framework.

“As Chairman of the National Command Authority, his Government fully accepts the responsibility of nuclear security, which reflects the determination of the political Government to accept the responsibility collectively,” he further said.

The Prime Minister said that nuclear power generation offers viable solutions for energy addressing the challenge of climate change. He mentioned that Pakistan had more than 35 years experience of operating nuclear power plants successfully. He further said that highly trained manpower and a well established foolproof safety and security culture fully qualified Pakistan for equal participation in civil nuclear cooperation at the international level, which

would help Pakistan in addressing immediate energy problems and would bring greater stability as well.

The Prime Minister said, "Pakistan is a democratic, progressive and peaceful country, adding, "Our socio-economic development hinges on our ability to meet rapidly expanding energy requirements". He stressed the need of exploring all options to ensure a reliable energy mix and civil nuclear power generation, which was, therefore, an essential part of the country's national energy strategy.

The Prime Minister declared that the Government considered nuclear safety and security as vehicles to facilitate international civil nuclear cooperation. He observed that the objectives of nuclear non-proliferation, safety and security could only be served and promoted through a non-discriminatory paradigm for the international cooperation in the peaceful use of nuclear energy. Pakistan, he added, needs access to civilian nuclear technology on a non-discriminatory basis.

Earlier, Lt. General (Rtd) Khalid Ahmed Kidwai, DG SPD, briefed the Parliamentary Committee on Pakistan's Nuclear Programme and Security of Nuclear Assets. During his presentation, he mentioned that Pakistan had one of the best systems for the safety and security of nuclear assets and technology both on the defence and civilian side.

Masood Khan, Pakistan's Ambassador in China, who participated in the preliminary deliberations of the forthcoming Nuclear Summit in Washington, apprised the Parliamentary Committee on the objectives of the Summit and the preparations made by Pakistan to contribute in the deliberations of the Summit positively.

The USA, he mentioned, has already made the objectives public, which were a manifestation of President Barak Obama's three points strategy for non-proliferation of nuclear technology in the interest of global security. He also apprised that while leading the Pakistan delegation at the Summit the Prime Minister was likely to meet other leaders on the sidelines of Summit.

The representatives of all the political parties in the Parliament Committee on National Defence applauded the gesture of the Prime Minister for taking them into confidence prior to his participation in an important international Summit. They assured him of complete support and expressed confidence that he would be able to put across Pakistan's viewpoint forcefully being a democratically elected Prime Minister enjoying complete backing of the entire nation.

The members of the Committee also appreciated the preparations made by the Pakistani side for the Summit and expressed satisfaction over policies and measures in place for the safety and security of nuclear materials and facilities in Pakistan. The members also gave suggestions on various aspects of the subject of the Summit, which were aptly accommodated.

The special meeting was also attended by Mr Ahmed Mukhtar, Defence Minister, General Tariq Majid, Chairman Joint Chief of Staff Committee and the Foreign Secretary.

The leaders of the Parliamentary parties who attended the meeting represented PPPP, PML-N, PML-Q, ANP, JI, MQM, PML-F, PPP-S, PKMAP, BNP-A and JWP.

Monitoring Desk adds: Masood told the Committee that Pakistan and China would attend the US summit with a joint strategy, reported a private TV channel, quoting sources.

He said China would support Pakistan demand that the United States also makes a civilian nuclear deal with Pakistan like it had done with India.

<http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online//Politics/08-Apr-2010/Pak-China-to-adopt-joint-strategy-at-US-nuclear-summit>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

<http://www.dailynk.com/english/index.php>

30 March 2010

North Korea Scorns UN Human Rights Move

By Kim Yong Hun

North Korea has fiercely criticized the March 25th passing of the latest UN North Korean Human Rights Resolution, calling it a “political plot” to overthrow the Pyongyang regime.

The North Korean Ministry of Foreign Affairs responded to the news on March 29th, saying, “The ‘Resolution’, consisting of distortions and fabrications just like last year, is the fruit of a political plot by the United States and Japan, who are trying to alter and break up the North Korean system under the guise of human rights protection.”

In a Q&A interview with the Chosun Central News Agency (KCNA), a spokesperson for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs emphasized, “(The adoption of the human rights resolution) is a delusional attempt to change us through confrontation and pressure. The EU, which chose not to communicate and cooperate on the human rights issue and joined the enemy forces of confrontation, played the role of midwife once again this time.”

The spokesperson also stated, “We refuse to acknowledge and denounce the anti-republic ‘resolution’ adopted every year since 2003 and the ‘Special Rapporteur’ who is appointed by the resolution.”

The spokesperson further criticized the “Special Rapporteur” concept as a system applied in anti-American and independent states, a “well-known vestige of selectivity”, and a two-faced notion which ignores fairness and objectivity in human rights issues.

“The ‘Special Rapporteur’ is an anachronism at a time when a ‘regular deliberation system’, which treats all members of the United Nations fairly in universal humanitarian conditions, exists,” the spokesperson reiterated, “It is an open challenge to the (regular deliberation) system.”

Finally, the spokesperson concluded that, regardless of the UN, “We will strengthen and develop the socialist human rights guarantee chosen by our citizens while stopping the anti-republic human rights plot maneuvers of the enemy forces.”

<http://www.dailynk.com/english/read.php?cataId=nk01700&num=6179>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

<http://toi.timesofindia.indiatimes.com>

6 April 2010

'China ready to stay out of PoK'

Saibal Dasgupta, TNN

BEIJING: China's policy towards Pakistan will remain unchanged even after the attack on the US consulate in Peshawar on Monday, a Chinese expert connected to the government said. But Chinese leaders are ready to consider Indian request to keep the country's construction companies from entering Pakistan occupied Kashmir, he said.

"There is a lot of anger against the US as even ordinary people have been hit during military strikes in Pakistan. It is different in the case of China as we are building the social infrastructure in the region bordering Pakistan and Afghanistan," Ma Jiali, senior researcher at the state-run China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations, said.

Foreign minister S M Krishna is expected to discuss the volatile political situation in Pakistan and its relationship with India during his meetings with Chinese foreign minister Yang Jiechi, and premier Wen Jiabao on Wednesday. He was due to arrive in Beijing along with foreign secretary Nirupama Rao for a 4-day tour late on Monday evening. Ma said China is careful about Indian sensitivities concerning investments in the PoK area. "But there is not going to

be a change in our policy towards Pakistan. Our ties with Pakistan are based on bilateral interests, and they run very deep," he said.

"China is conscious that India is opposed to the play of a third factor in the process of settling its relationship with Pakistan," he said. The statement is significant because Pakistani foreign minister Shah Mehmood Qureshi recently offered Beijing a blank cheque to intervene in the India-Pakistan dialogue.

"Chinese leaders want to help India play a bigger role in the United Nations and its Security Council," Ma said, referring to Delhi's efforts to secure a permanent seat in the UNSC.

"But India should realize it is a sensitive issue for China because neighbouring Japan is also competing for a seat in the UNSC," he said.

<http://toi.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/china/China-ready-to-stay-out-of-PoK/articleshow/5764886.cms>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

2 April 2010

NORTH KOREA HAS NUCLEAR WEAPONS, CLINTON SAYS

by Anthony L. Kimery

CIA reports North Korea continues to be major exporter of nuclear weapons technology

Signaling a potential significant shift in the US' diplomatic and strategic posture towards North Korea, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton surprisingly told journalists at a meeting of the Group of Eight industrialized nations in Canada Tuesday that "North Korea ... already has nuclear weapons."

The *Korea Times*' initial report that Clinton verbally called North Korea a nuclear-armed state has been viewed as a sudden and highly unusual divergence from the United States' heretofore traditionally diplomatic stance on the matter.

"We recognize the new threats that are coming ... from rogue regimes like North Korea that already has nuclear weapons, and regimes like that in Iran that are clearly seeking nuclear weapons," Clinton told the group of journalists.

Washington had withheld from explicitly acknowledging that North Korea is a nuclear-armed nation, even though US WMD intelligence officials have believed for some time that Kim Jong-il's regime had produced enough plutonium to build an unspecified number of nuclear weapons, which the Stalinist regime has the plans for, and the capability to construct.

Officially, the US has only acknowledged that Pyongyang has conducted two nuclear tests, but not believed to have yet developed the ability to place a nuclear warhead on a missile.

Clinton's disclosure, though, comports with what WMD intelligence authorities - behind closed doors - believe to be true based on the product of aggressive intelligence collection targeting North Korea.

Clinton's revelation came on the heels of the CIA, in its annual unclassified report to Congress on "key countries" assessed to be seeking weapons of mass destruction (WMD) capabilities, reported that "in September 2009, North Korea announced that reprocessing of ... spent fuel rods was in the final stages and that the recovered plutonium was being weaponized."

North Korea announced in September that it had "entered the final stage" of uranium enrichment.

"The North's probable nuclear test in May 2009 - apparently more successful than its 2006 test - suggests the North has the capability to produce nuclear weapons with a yield of roughly a couple kilotons TNT equivalent," the CIA's assessment stated. "In June 2009, North Korea announced that it had begun uranium enrichment work at a test stage and was developing technology to produce fuel for a light-water reactor. In September 2009, North Korea reported that its uranium enrichment work had entered the final stage."

The Washington-based Arms Control Association has said North Korea is a "state of immediate proliferation concern."

Indeed, the CIA's Weapons Intelligence, Nonproliferation and Arms Control Center (WINPAC) latest report stated that North Korea ... continue[s] to sell technologies and components in the Middle East and South Asia that are dual use and could support WMD and missile programs. North Korea is among the world's leading suppliers of ballistic missiles and related technologies."

Continuing, the report stated "North Korea remains committed to selling missiles and related technologies to foreign customers. Over the years, it has exported ballistic missile-related equipment, components, materials, technical expertise, and/or full missile systems to countries in the Middle East, South Asia, and North Africa. North Korea has demonstrated a willingness to sell complete ballistic missile systems and components that have enabled other states to acquire longer-range capabilities earlier than would otherwise have been possible and to acquire the basis for domestic development efforts."

Most disturbingly, the CIA stated, "North Korea's relationship with Iran and Syria remains strong. North Korea provided assistance to Syria's covert nuclear effort starting in the late 1990s and retains the potential for exporting nuclear materials or technology."

The CIA further reported this past week in its annual assessment to Congress that "North Korea continues to pursue the development, production, and deployment of ballistic missiles with increasing range and sophistication. It continues to procure needed raw materials and components from various foreign sources to support its missile industry.

North Korea in April 2009 launched a Taepo Dong 2 which passed over Japan. It failed in its stated mission of orbiting a small communications satellite, but successfully tested several technologies associated with an ICBM. The UN Security Council subsequently issued a presidential statement condemning the launch as a contravention of UN Security Council Resolution 1718;

North Korea's foreign ministry in April 2009 publicly threatened to conduct flight tests of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) at an unspecified time;

In July it launched series of road-mobile Scud-based missiles. This launch activity was very similar to the series of launches it conducted in July 2006. North Korea also continues to develop a mobile IRBM as well as a mobile solid-propellant SRBM.

State Department spokesman Mark Toner would not say whether Clinton's remark indicated a substantive shift in US policy toward North Korea, which in recent months has become increasingly belligerent and, according to WMD counterproliferation officials, has been found trying to ship significant quantities of ballistic missile components and other technologies to a variety of unstable governments.

"On North Korea, I would just say that we remain steadfastly committed to getting the six-party talks going again," Toner said.

<http://www.hstoday.us/content/view/12753/149/>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

ASSOCIATED PRESS

8 April 2010

Iran derides Obama's 'cowboy' nuclear stance 'Get some experience,' Ahmadinejad says

By Ali Akbar Dareini and George Jahn

TEHRAN, Iran | U.S. allies on Wednesday lined up behind President Obama's new policy aimed at reducing the likelihood of nuclear conflict. But Iran — classified as a possible target under the guidelines — dismissed it as a "cowboy" policy by a political newcomer doomed to fail.

Russian President Dmitry Medvedev, in the Slovak capital Bratislava for an official visit, did not address the issue before leaving for Prague to sign a landmark treaty Thursday with Mr. Obama aimed at paring U.S.-Russian

strategic nuclear weapons by 30 percent. But Washington's supporters in Asia and Europe welcomed Mr. Obama's pledge Tuesday to reduce America's nuclear arsenal, refrain from nuclear tests and not use nuclear weapons against countries that do not have them.

North Korea and Iran were not included in that pledge because they do not cooperate with other countries on nonproliferation standards.

The U.S. considers them nuclear rogues — Pyongyang for developing and testing nuclear weapons and Tehran because it is suspected of trying to do the same under the cover of a peaceful program, something Iran denies. Outlining the policy Tuesday, Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates said the focus would now be on terror groups such as al Qaeda as well as North Korea's nuclear buildup and Iran's nuclear ambitions.

Addressing thousands in the country's northwest, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad derided Mr. Obama over the plan.

"American materialist politicians, whenever they are beaten by logic, immediately resort to their weapons like cowboys," Mr. Ahmadinejad said in a speech before a crowd of several thousand in northwestern Iran. "Mr. Obama, you are a newcomer [to politics]. Wait until your sweat dries and get some experience. Be careful not to read just any paper put in front of you or repeat any statement recommended," Mr. Ahmadinejad said in the speech, aired live on state TV.

Mr. Ahmadinejad said Mr. Obama "is under the pressure of capitalists and the Zionists" and vowed Iran would not be pushed around.

American officials "bigger than you, more bullying than you, couldn't do a damn thing, let alone you," he said, addressing Mr. Obama.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu — whose country is the only Mideast nation considered to have nuclear weapons — dismissed speculation that the Jewish state could come under pressure.

"I'm not concerned that anyone would think that Israel is a terrorist regime," he said. "Everybody knows a terrorist and rouge regime when they see one, and believe me, they see quite a few around Israel."

Washington's key European partners in its efforts to contain Iran's nuclear activities welcomed the Obama initiative.

British Defense Secretary Bob Ainsworth said it "delivers strong progress" on pledges first made a year ago, adding Britain "looks forward to working closely with the U.S. and other key allies and partners in the future."

Foreign Ministry spokesman Bernard Valero of France, like Britain a nuclear weapons state that backs global disarmament efforts, said Mr. Obama's nuclear posture "is convergent with our views."

www.washingtontimes.com

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

<http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/index.html>

7 April 2010

President Obama's Nuclear Summit: Q&A with Professor Graham Allison

Q&A

Author: Graham Allison,

1. WHY?: With all the balls that President Obama is currently trying to juggle, why invite 46 heads of state to Washington?

Despite many differences, on one issue there is 100% agreement between Presidents Obama and Bush. When asked: "What is the single most serious threat to Americans' national security today," both agree: **Nuclear Terrorism.**

Psychologically, who can imagine terrorists exploding a nuclear bomb devastating the heart of New York or Moscow or Mumbai? Analytically, there is only one difference between the 9/11 attack that killed 3,000 in New York, or the 11/26 attack that killed nearly 200 in Mumbai, and a nuclear 9/11 or Mumbai that could extinguish 300,000 lives. That singular difference is terrorists getting a nuclear bomb.

2. OBJECTIVE: What is the objective of the Nuclear Security Summit? What do the leaders hope to accomplish?

The stated objectives for the world's first Nuclear Security Summit in one sentence are: (1) to raise the consciousness of leaders whose governments' current actions are increasing or reducing the likelihood of terrorists getting a nuclear bomb, and (2) to create an action-forcing process to motivate leaders certain to take specific actions in preparation for the Summit or will commit to take by dates in the near future.

3. CONFUSION: Why is there so much confusion about this event?

This has never been done before. This is the world's first event focusing specifically on this threat.

"Nuclear" is a symbolic word that triggers many more familiar issues: nuclear weapons, nuclear proliferation and Iran, nuclear arms control agreements like the New START agreement that will be signed in Prague this week, or nuclear power plants. Each of these is important. **None** of these is the focus of this Summit.

The **big idea** that this Summit will focus on like a laser beam is that the leaders assembled have the power to successfully **prevent nuclear terrorism**. They can prevent the only terrorist attack that would kill hundreds of thousands of individuals in a single blow. Indeed, they can prevent nuclear terrorism by doing just one thing: **denying terrorists the means** to achieve their deadliest ambitions.

Imagine that all nuclear weapons and all nuclear weapons-usable materials were locked up as good as gold in Fort Knox or treasures in the Kremlin Armory. We would have reduced the likelihood of a nuclear terrorist attack to nearly zero.

4. TAKEAWAYS: What should leaders take away from this event?

Vivid, visceral appreciation that nuclear terrorism threatens not just the U.S. or Russia but every great city in the civilized world. Since 9/11, global terrorists have killed double- and triple-digit numbers of individuals in Bali (2002), Madrid (2004), and London (2005).

Commitment to lock down all nuclear weapons and materials to a "gold standard" -- beyond the reach of thieves or terrorists -- and to do so on the fastest, technically-feasible timetable. President Obama hopes that the leaders who come will join him in his commitment to achieve this goal before the end of 2012.

5. FOR EXAMPLE: How can these abstract ambitions be made more concrete? What are examples of specific actions that have been taken or will be taken that make it less likely we will suffer a nuclear 9/11?

Looking back at recent history:

- In 1993, 20 bombs-worth of HEU was discovered in newly-independent Kazakhstan. Both Iran and Iraq had opened import-export businesses near this material and were shopping. In "Operation Sapphire," the U.S. extracted this material, which is now safely stored in Oak Ridge, Tennessee.
- In 2002, three nuclear bombs-worth of HEU was removed from Vincas, a suburb of Belgrade, Yugoslavia, in a joint U.S.-Russian cooperative threat reduction initiative. That material had remained under the authority of Serbian war criminal Slobodan Milosevic before, during, and for three years after a U.S./NATO air bombing campaign compelled Milosevic to retreat from Kosovo.

For additional examples, see the Belfer Center website.

In preparing to come to this Summit, Turkey, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, Belarus and others have already taken specific actions to secure hundreds of potential nuclear weapons that, in the hands of terrorists, could destroy one of the great cities of the world.

At this Summit, many additional leaders are expected to make unambiguous commitments to take specific, observable actions by dates certain that will secure thousands of additional nuclear weapons equivalents.

6. SCORING: How should objective observers score this event?

Beneath the rhetoric, what are the bottom lines?

Specific actions states have taken in preparation for coming to Washington that make citizens safer from the threat terrorists explode a nuclear bomb.

Unambiguous commitments leaders make to take specific, observable actions by dates certain that will secure additional thousands of nuclear weapons and equivalents.

http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/20058/president_obamas_nuclear_summit.html?breadcrumb=%2Fto pic%2F2%2Fnuclear_issues%3Fgroupby%3D0%26filter%3D2010

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

CFR.org

Interview

5 April 2010

Obama's Nuclear Plans Face Daunting Obstacles

Interviewee: Henry Sokolski, Executive Director, Nonproliferation Policy Education Center

Interviewer: Bernard Gwertzman CFR.org

This month, the Obama administration's focus will be the start of a full-court press to reduce the number and spread of nuclear weapons, including the signing of the follow-on to the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty with Russia on April 8 in Prague and a nuclear summit of forty countries in Washington beginning on April 11. Domestic political push-back from Republicans, resistance by other nations, and the complexities of drafting agreements without loopholes will make it tough for the administration to achieve its objectives, says nuclear proliferation expert Henry Sokolski. Even within the administration, he says, some are trying to lower their expectations.

What is it that the administration is trying to achieve with all this nuclear discussion?

The president is trying to achieve the vision that he laid out in Prague on April 5 last year. In that speech he laid out four general objectives. One was to reduce the number of nuclear weapons systems in the world and reduce the likelihood of their use. The second was to reduce or eliminate the prospect of any further nuclear testing. The third was to stop any further production of nuclear materials that could be used directly to make weapons. And fourth, he made a number of recommendations that he thought would strengthen the rules against the further spread of nuclear weapons capabilities, technologies, and materials.

Now, those four objectives were tied very closely in the speech to specific treaties. In the case of the first objective, he wanted to reach this initial START agreement and then keep reaching additional strategic arms reduction treaties, not only with Russia but other countries. In regard to nuclear testing, he wanted the Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and to bring that into force internationally. The Senate failed to ratify it when President Bill Clinton brought it for approval. Third, with regard to blocking the further production of materials that could be used directly to make bombs, he wanted a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMCT) to be negotiated and brought into force. And with regard to strengthening nuclear rules, one of them was this summit that we're going to have in Washington on security of nuclear materials against theft. He wanted to strengthen the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, and he had a number of ideas there as well.

Is the administration likely to achieve these goals?

I think it's going to be a stretch on two levels. First, treaties that are international can only be brought into force not only if we ratify them, but [if] a number of other countries do also. In the case of the CTBT, he needs the consent of

countries like India, Pakistan, Iran, North Korea, Egypt, Brazil, Mexico, and any number of other countries who, historically, have lots of questions and concerns that make ratification less than a sure thing. I would guess it would be a long, long time, even if the United States got these agreements ratified--and in the case of Fissile Material Cutoff treaty, drafted--before they would ever come into force. And some people think never.

I'll give you an example. The Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty is supposed to be negotiated in Geneva at the Comprehensive Disarmament Talks. The Pakistanis are refusing to allow the matter to be brought up. And in the case of the Comprehensive Test Ban, you certainly have countries like Egypt that say, "We will approve but only if Israel joins the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty as a non-weapon state." So, bringing these things into force is not a sure thing.

Then there is a second problem. If you rush these agreements into implementation, you could actually compound some of your problems.

Let me give you an example in the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Then I'll give you an example of the Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty.

I would guess it would be a long, long time, even if the United States got these agreements ratified--and in the case of Fissile Material Cutoff treaty, drafted--before they would ever come into force. And some people think never.

Critics of the CTBT claim that the Russians have a more liberal view as to what the ban prohibits. These critics fear that Russia thinks that you can have low-level nuclear tests and still be compliant with the CTBT. Well, the Congressional Commission report that was produced by former Defense secretaries James R. Schlesinger and William J. Perry said that this in fact was a serious enough concern that the five recognized states that have nuclear weapons--the United States, Britain, France, Russia, and China--needed to reach an agreement not only on what was allowed but what was clearly prohibited under the treaty. Now, if you get an agreement that allows low-level testing, I'm not sure you want to bring that into force, because right now we at least have political moratoriums in all of these countries that don't hold tests. It might actually weaken things if you don't get a good definition of what's prohibited.

In the FMCT you have another oddity. It only bans the production of highly enriched uranium and plutonium for military weapons. That means that you could still make those materials if you claimed they were for civil purposes.

Which is what Iran is doing?

But Iran is officially not a military weapons state. It [the Fissile Material Treaty] only bans states that are non-weapons states from continuing to make materials. The problem is that if you are Iran and you're a non-weapons state, and you see weapons states being able to continue to make nuclear fuel for civil purposes under loose inspection procedures, you've got to raise your voice and say, "I don't even have weapons, why can't I make enriched uranium for civil purposes like the weapons states under the loose inspection procedures that they are obligated to? Why are you picking on me?" So, you've got to straighten that out, and I don't know if we're up to that.

Let me come back to the START treaty. Is it likely to be ratified this year?

No Republican has any appetite to hand a victory to the head of the Democratic Party. The practical truth is that although the administration wants to get the treaty ratified before the end of the year, and may succeed, it will most likely occur only in a lame duck session after the elections. The conventional wisdom is that after the elections, when there are more Republicans voted in, the Republicans will probably support the treaty if their key concerns are addressed.

And the key concerns are what?

There are three concerns raised by critics, and those are the three concerns that Republicans are going to focus on. The first is that the law currently requires the administration to lay out a ten-year plan with budget estimates about how they intend to keep our nuclear weapons reliable, safe, and up to date. The administration has not yet done this, as I understand it. So the Senate is going to ask for that almost certainly. Second, the numbers permitted are lower than what some people wanted them to be. The critics of this agreement are not happy that the numbers went a little bit lower than were forecast initially.

Do you know what the numbers are?

It's a complex formula I'm told. But what you see in the press is that the number of warheads should be no more than 1,550, but they should be on delivery systems that when deployed are no more than seven hundred. You can have another hundred that are not operationally deployed. But we're told the counting rules for what constitutes a weapon are a little complex. A bomber, for example, carrying many bombs would only count as one weapon. So we have to wait until the text is released to get the exact numbers of what's being counted.

The critics say, "If you're going to have tight restrictions like that, then we've got to be especially careful with the law to follow, and you need the layout, budget and the plans for the next ten years to keep the nuclear weapons force modern and reliable." So that's point one.

The practical truth is that although the administration wants to get the treaty ratified before the end of the year, and may succeed, it will most likely occur only in a lame duck session after the elections.

The second thing that's in the treaty--and, again, language has been leaked, but we haven't actually seen it so we don't know if that's authentic--is that it says that both sides can engage in "limited missile defenses." The words "limited missile defenses" would be consistent with this treaty, and if one goes beyond limited missile defenses, [the other] would have the right to leave. So, first question is, "What is a limited defense program consistent with this treaty?" The answer almost certainly that the administration would give is, "Well it's our program which we reported to Congress on recently, and it's based on detection and further development of what's called interceptor missiles." The question there would be, "Wait a minute, the standard missile systems that you reported on depends on being upgraded in ways which some technical critics of the system doubt may be possible."

All of that will be debated, I'm pretty sure, and fleshed out to make sure we know what the limited missile plan is that's consistent with this treaty and that we have a good program to make sure that we achieve what the limited system is. And that it isn't just dependent on some things that haven't even been perfected yet, but that we have two or three ways to achieve those goals.

You believe the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty still won't be ratified?

Given that we already have a moratorium on testing, the necessity of this is not clear, and some are actually eager to retain the option of testing, so that will be an uphill battle, particularly after November.

Can you talk about the limits on fissile material, which the president wants to raise in the Washington summit?

If he does, he needs to talk mostly to those countries that don't even want to begin negotiations. Substantively, it's not clear how that helps unless you figure out how to deal with all the civil production questions and the precedents this treaty might set for countries like Iran.

Strengthening the Nonproliferation Treaty is the focus of the conference in May at the United Nations. You're not expecting anything really hard and fast to come out of this?

Well, it's an assembly of the whole. There are key nations that will be out there as they are every five years, spoiling to block any kind of effort to get binding consensus on specifics, so you have to lower your expectations. I don't know if it's possible, but the Egyptians of the world are going to demand attention be paid to denuclearizing Israel before they would agree to much, and they will have other supporters. There are countries that will demand that Iran's right to get to the very edge of making bombs for nuclear fuel-making be recognized and not tampered with. And there will be a lot of undercurrents that will make reaching some new consensus difficult.

The hope is that the president's various proposals might bear fruit. He laid them out in September when he chaired the Security Council, and they form the basis of Resolution 1887. One of them is to make withdrawal from the NPT, if you're in violation, much more difficult. Another is automatic default sanctions of some sort for various levels of violations. All of those rather practical, sound things he hoped would get more of a hearing. But it will be difficult to get consensus for them. We will have to wait and see, but some people even within the administration are privately trying to lower expectations.

http://www.cfr.org/publication/21826/obamas_nuclear_plans_face_daunting_obstacles.html
(Return to Articles and Documents List)

<http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/>

The Associated Press

6 April 2010

Gates warns Iran and North Korea on nuke policy

WASHINGTON — Defense Secretary Robert Gates said Tuesday that unprecedented limits being placed on the U.S. nuclear arsenal won't weaken the nation's defense and will send a "strong message" to Iran and North Korea to "play by the rules."

Under the plan, the U.S. would narrow the circumstances under which a nuclear weapon would be used. The new policy would not apply to states like North Korea and Iran because of their refusal to cooperate with the international community on nonproliferation standards.

"All options are on the table when it comes to countries in that category," Gates said.

Obama also has stopped short of saying the U.S. will never be the first to launch a nuclear attack, as many arms control advocates want.

Gates said the administration decided against limiting the nation's options further because of the danger still being posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

"This is obviously a weapon of last resort," Gates told reporters at a press conference at the Pentagon. But "we also recognize the real world we continue to live in."

Gates was joined by other cabinet members in announcing the plan, including Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton and Energy Secretary Steven Chu.

Gates said that a new policy restricting the use of nuclear weapons did not apply to countries such as Iran and North Korea, which are pursuing nuclear weapons in defiance of the international community.

He said "all options are on the table when it comes to countries in that category." He also said the U.S. was moving toward a policy of no first use of nuclear weapons, but wasn't yet ready to do so. Gates said he didn't believe "we were far enough along the road" toward controlling nuclear weapons around the world to give up the right to pre-emptive strikes.

http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2010/04/ap_gates_nuclear_policy_040610/

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)